

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:)	
)	
Inventors: Kai-Chieh Liang)	
)	
Serial No.: 10/670,949)	ATTORNEY FILE NO.
)	SLA1325
)	
Filed: September 25, 2003)	
)	
Title: URI POINTER SYSTEM AND)	Customer No.: 55,286
METHOD FOR THE)	Examiner: Luong, Alan H.
CARRIAGE OF MPEG-4 DATA)	
IN AN MPEG-2 TRANSPORT)	Art Unit: 2623
<u>STREAM FILE SYSTEM</u>)	<u>Conf. No.: 2056</u>

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This paper is responsive to an Examiner's Answer by Examiner Alan H. Luong, Group Art Unit 2623, regarding claims 1, 6-15, 20-26, 31-40, and 45-50, of the above-referenced application.

REMARKS

In discussing the Herpel reference and addressing schemes, the *Response to Arguments* Section of the Examiner Answer (Section 10) states that, "... MPEG-4 may be addressed by using ATM, RTP." In traverse, the Applicant notes that ATM and RTP are transport protocols, not addressing schemes. MPEG-4 can be delivered over several kinds of transports such as an MPEG-2 transport stream, ATM, RTP, and many others. Actually, one of the design goals behind the MPEG-4 specification was to NOT to specify any specific transport, but leave the transport of MPEG-4 open to any transport technology. But TRANSPORT, i.e. a delivery or conveyance method is not an ADDRESSING scheme. To use a simple mail analogy, transport is a vehicle, while addressing is a residential address.

While Herpel is primarily concerned with an ES_ID addressing scheme, a brief mention of URL type addressing occurs on page 316. Herpel notes that an OD, which the Applicant refers to as an IOD, contains a list of elementary stream descriptors that can only be identified using an ES_ID or a URL. However, Herpel states that a URL points to ODs (IODs) in a remote location. In contrast, the Applicant's base claims recite a lid URI carried in an MPEG-2 TS to recover (local) resources in the TS.

As described in detail in the Applicant's Brief (pages 12 through 14), the Waki disclosure fails to mention the term "MPEG-4" or "lid URI". Yet, Waki is being used to support the supposition that the

Applicant's lid URI limitation is obvious. On page 15 of the ***Response to Arguments*** Section, an attempt is made to bridge Waki's discussion of a Service Domain specified by an NSAP address to the MPEG-4 standard. However, no evidence is provided from the Waki reference to support the statement that an NSAP address is similar to a lid URI. A detailed discussion of NSAP addressing is provided on pages 9-10 of the Applicant's Brief. In summary, an IOD is the (addressing) gateway used in the MPEG-4 protocol. DSM-CC (MPEG-2) may use an IOR or NASP addressing scheme (as Waki). However, MPEG-4 data cannot be addressed using an MPEG-2 IOR or NSAP scheme. IOR (MPEG-2, Waki) is not the same as IOD (MPEG-4).

The ***Response to Arguments*** Section (page 14) states that the Applicant cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually. The Applicant notes that the Appeal Brief (pages 16-17) presents reasoning why the prior cannot be combined to make the claimed invention obvious. Further, a *prima facie* case for obviousness cannot be supported without an argument to combine references. The arguments made by the Examiner to combine references appear to be as follows:

The Answer states that Herpel shows URL addressing (Answer; page 14). However, as noted above, Herpel states that URLs are used to address *remote* resources. The claimed invention recites a lid URI to address *local* resources (in the TS).

The Answer states that Waki's MPEG-2 NSAP addressing is similar to MPEG-4 address in general, and the use of a lid URI in particular. However, as noted above, an MPEG-2 IOR or NSAP address cannot be used to address MPEG-4 resources.

The Applicant submits that a practitioner having access to the Waki reference would be taught the use of MPEG-2, and that access to the Herpel reference would teach the use of a URL to address remote resource. However, neither reference discusses the use of a lid URI, and no evidence has been provided that the combination of references suggests that a lid URI can be used to address (provide a binding name and access scheme) objects in the same MPEG-2 TS that is being used to carry the lid URI.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/4/2009

/Mali/
Gerald Maliszewski
Registration No. 38,054

Customer Number 55,286
P.O. Box 270829
San Diego, CA 92198-2829
Telephone: (858) 451-9950
Facsimile: (858) 451-9869
gerry@ipatentit.net